

1 Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607)  
2 Kelly M. Dermody (State Bar No. 171716)  
3 Brendan P. Glackin (State Bar No. 199643)  
4 Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 250298)  
5 Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255928)  
6 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &  
BERNSTEIN, LLP  
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3339  
Telephone: 415.956.1000  
Facsimile: 415.956.1008

## 7 || *Co-Lead Class Counsel*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

13 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

14 ALL ACTIONS

**Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK**

## **CLASS ACTION**

**DECLARATION OF BRENDAN GLACKIN  
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR APPROVAL  
OF ATTORNEYS FEES, REIMBURSEMENT  
OF EXPENSES AND SERVICE AWARDS**

1 I, Brendan P. Glackin, declare:

2       1. I am a partner in the law firm of Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein, LLP  
 3 (“LCHB”), a member of the State Bar of California, and am admitted to practice before the  
 4 United States District Court for the Northern District of California, as well as the courts of New  
 5 York State and numerous other federal courts. I am one of the lawyers for the Plaintiffs in this  
 6 action. I make this declaration based on my own personal knowledge and also based on (a) my  
 7 review of written and electronic records kept in the ordinary course of business at LCHB and (b)  
 8 things I learned in the course of supervising other LCHB team members, or from my partners  
 9 Kelly M. Dermody and Dean M. Harvey, in the course of litigating the case. I have also used  
 10 LCHB records to refresh my recollection as to some events described herein.

11       2. This declaration summarizes the work performed by LCHB in connection with this  
 12 matter. In some places it describes work performed by other class counsel (Joseph Saveri Law  
 13 Firm (“JSLF”), Berger & Montague (“B&M”) and Grant & Eisenhofer (“G&E”), with LCHB  
 14 “Class Counsel”) for purposes of context. It is not a complete statement of work done by other  
 15 Class Counsel firms. Those firms are submitting their own descriptions of work performed.

16 **I. Time Records of LCHB**

17       3. LCHB maintains, and has for many years maintained, an electronic timekeeping  
 18 database. Most attorneys write down their time on paper, which is then entered into the database  
 19 by administrative assistants or the billing department.<sup>1</sup> LCHB requires attorneys and staff to  
 20 submit time records contemporaneously, i.e. promptly. The LCHB timekeeping system issues an  
 21 “alert” to the partner who oversees the system, Kelly Dermody, in the event a timekeeper falls  
 22 behind in submitting his or her time.<sup>2</sup> As more fully explained in the Declaration of Kelly M.  
 23 Dermody, the attorneys and staff working on this matter entered their time promptly in  
 24 accordance with firm policy. LCHB’s timekeeping database is maintained by staff in the  
 25 accounting department. The database can create summary and/or detailed reports with just a few

---

26  
 27 <sup>1</sup> Some attorneys prefer to enter time into the database directly, and do so.

28 <sup>2</sup> By way of example, I believe I have received two or at most three such reminders in my seven  
 years at LCHB. Each time, my assistant had fallen behind in entering my paper timesheets into  
 the system. The situation was promptly remedied.

1 keystrokes.

2 **II. History of Work Performed in the Case by LCHB**

3 1. From the inception of this case to the present, LCHB has either led or exclusively  
 4 handled nearly all aspects of the litigation, with the exceptions of document review performed  
 5 independently by other firms and certain depositions.

6 2. LCHB researched, drafted, served, and filed almost every pleading in this matter,  
 7 including virtually all major briefs: this includes oppositions to Defendants' motions to dismiss,  
 8 both motions for class certification and replies in support, and the consolidated opposition to  
 9 Defendants' motions for summary judgment. This work included researching, compiling, and  
 10 filing substantial documentary evidence, all of which was handled by LCHB attorneys and  
 11 support staff. Out of the 276 pleadings Plaintiffs filed in this case, LCHB prepared and filed 249  
 12 of them, or 90%. Out of the 53 attorney declarations Plaintiffs filed, LCHB attorneys authored 50  
 13 of them, or 94%. Out of the 2,038 exhibits attached to attorney declarations, 2,037 of them were  
 14 attached to declarations authored by LCHB attorneys, or more than 99%.

15 3. While all Class Counsel were involved in document work, LCHB conducted  
 16 nearly all meet and confers with Defendants. This is demonstrated by the correspondence  
 17 between Plaintiffs and Defendants. Throughout this action, Plaintiffs served 206 letters on  
 18 Defendants (in addition to substantial email correspondence). LCHB attorneys authored 189 of  
 19 them, or 92%.

20 4. LCHB supervised the work of all experts who assisted Plaintiffs in this matter:  
 21 Drs. Hallock, Leamer, Manning, and Marx. LCHB supervised the creation of all 10 of Plaintiffs'  
 22 expert reports. LCHB prepared all Plaintiffs' experts for deposition and first-chaired the defense  
 23 of all of them. Out of the 17 expert depositions that occurred in this case, LCHB took or  
 24 defended 14 of them, or 82%. Of the remaining 3 depositions, Eric Cramer of B&M took one,  
 25 and Mr. Saveri of JSLF took two.

26 5. G&E and B&M joined the case in 2011. As described herein and in their  
 27 submissions, G&E and B&M both made contributions to document review, depositions, and  
 28 brief-writing. Both firms contributed high-level and important work including comments and

1 edits to the Rule 12 oppositions and class certification and expert papers; taking major  
 2 depositions including expert depositions; and taking primary drafting responsibility for certain  
 3 pre-trial submissions such as the *per se* briefs. Linda Nussbaum, then-of G&E, and Eric Cramer  
 4 of B&M are both seasoned antitrust litigators who have each served many times as lead counsel  
 5 in other cases.

6       6. JSLF came into the case in 2012. LCHB and JSLF divided document review work  
 7 approximately equally. LCHB took about half of the fact depositions, and JSLF took most of the  
 8 balance. JSLF contributed to assembling facts and testimony relevant to various major briefs and  
 9 Plaintiffs' discovery responses. JSLF wrote the first drafts of certain briefs and provided inserts,  
 10 comments, and edits to others. LCHB and JSLF jointly conducted settlement negotiations. JSLF  
 11 drafted settlement documents and assisted in the settlement and claims process. Specific work by  
 12 JSLF is discussed below.

13           A. **Inception to May 31, 2012**

14       7. We learned through discovery that the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department  
 15 ("DOJ") began investigating possible violations of the law by Defendants in 2009. LCHB opened  
 16 an investigation of this case on September 24, 2010, the same day the DOJ closed its  
 17 investigation into this case with stipulated final judgments. From that time until May 31, 2012,  
 18 counsel for the plaintiffs completed the following major tasks:

- 19           • Pre-filing research of the facts;
- 20           • Drafting complaints on behalf of the class representatives, who retained LCHB  
                 as counsel;
- 21           • Reviewing the materials produced by Defendants to the Department of Justice;
- 22           • Negotiating with opposing counsel regarding discovery issues, including  
                 collection, formatting, and production of electronically stored information  
                 (such as native format electronic documents and hundreds of databases of  
                 employee data), and identification of custodians;
- 23           • Opposing Rule 12 motions;
- 24           • Drafting, serving and enforcing written discovery;

- 1           • Identifying and retaining potential experts to assist the plaintiffs, and working
- 2           with those experts regarding discovery requests and developing evidence
- 3           concerning liability, impact, and damages; and
- 4           • Organizing the additional co-counsel firms of B&M and G&E to jointly
- 5           prosecute this action with LCHB.

6           8. During this first 19-month period, LCHB performed virtually all of this work, with  
 7           the assistance of G&E and B&M. The three principal LCHB timekeepers on the case, and their  
 8           hours, were:

Joseph Saveri	154.7
Dean M. Harvey	1,328.9
Katherine Lehe	466.9
	1,950.5

9           9. Other LCHB attorneys and staff invested substantial time in the matter, for a total  
 10          of 3,428.5 hours across all LCHB timekeepers during this period. A summary of all time  
 11          recorded by LCHB timekeepers during this period can be found at Exhibit A. Three hundred and  
 12          thirty-four of these hours were devoted to pre-filing investigation.

13           10. During this period of time Dean M. Harvey had principal responsibility for every  
 14          aspect of day-to-day prosecution of the case, under the supervision of partners Joseph Saveri and  
 15          Eric Fastiff. Mr. Harvey performed the initial case investigation and was the point of contact for  
 16          LCHB's clients (the five proposed class representatives). He researched and met with potential  
 17          experts. He drafted the initial complaints and the Consolidated Amended Complaint. He met and  
 18          conferred with opposing counsel, including negotiating stipulations, proposed orders, and a  
 19          variety of discovery issues. He created initial drafts and then revised and managed nearly every  
 20          filing during this period, including the oppositions to the motions to dismiss (Dkts. 91 and 92),  
 21          and many others (including Dkts. 32, 34-36, 44-46, 62, 63, 72, 93, 95, 102, 109, 115, and 134).  
 22          He managed all document review and evidence analysis, including the materials Defendants  
 23          initially produced to the DOJ and subpoenas Plaintiffs served on third parties. He and I consulted  
 24          with experts LCHB retained to analyze Defendants' documents and data and prepare a report  
 25          with respect to the Defendants' claims and defenses.

1 regarding class certification.

2       11. Ms. Lehe reviewed documents Defendants produced, researched and drafted  
 3 subpoenas to third parties, met and conferred with those third parties regarding their responses,  
 4 researched and drafted filings to enforce those subpoenas in a variety of jurisdictions across the  
 5 country, and researched and drafted several case management filings.

6       12. I personally reviewed and revised drafts of the complaints and the Rule 12  
 7 oppositions, among other things. I also met with and helped direct the work of the experts, along  
 8 with Mr. Harvey.

9       13. LCHB appeared before the Court to oppose the Rule 12 motions and at case  
 10 management conferences.

11       14. During this period of time, attorneys at B&M and G&E reviewed documents  
 12 Defendants produced; consulted with attorneys at LCHB and provided research regarding  
 13 Plaintiffs' theories of liability, class certification, impact, and damages; and assisted in discovery  
 14 regarding third parties, including drafting filings to enforce subpoenas.

15       15. In May 2012, at the end of this time period, LCHB partner Kelly M. Dermody  
 16 took over the management of this case for LCHB, and departed LCHB partner Joseph R. Saveri  
 17 started JSLF. The firms jointly proposed that Mr. Saveri and JSLF would continue to work on  
 18 the case.

19       **B. June 1, 2012, to October 31, 2012**

20       16. In June we began receiving compensation and other data from the Defendants,  
 21 which we began analyzing in preparation to file our motion for class certification on October 1,  
 22 2012. During this time the major tasks of Plaintiffs' counsel were:

- 23           • Continuing to prosecute written and document discovery against the  
 24 Defendants;
- 25           • Respond to written discovery served by the Defendants;
- 26           • Oversee the planning and drafting of a report by Dr. Leamer, including the  
 27 accompanying data analysis;
- 28           • Draft the motion for class certification and supporting declarations and

materials;

- Document review; and
  - Take 23 fact and 30(b)(6) depositions.<sup>3</sup>

17. The principal LCHB timekeepers working on the case during this period of time, and their hours, were:

Kelly M. Dermody	324.1
Brendan P. Glackin	256.7
Dean M. Harvey	756.7
Anne B. Shaver	443.1
Dale Ratner <sup>4</sup>	787.7
	2568.3

18. Other LCHB attorneys and staff invested substantial time in the matter, for a total of 4,177.2 hours across all LCHB timekeepers during this period. A summary of all time recorded by LCHB timekeepers during this period can be found at Exhibit B.

## 1. Class Certification

19. With strategic and editorial input from B&M and G&E, LCHB prepared the motion for class certification and accompanying materials. Attorneys Dean Harvey, Anne Shaver and Joe Forderer reviewed documents and evidence and drafted various sections of the brief. Attorney Dale Ratner reviewed Plaintiffs' documents for relevance and privilege for production and reviewed Defendants' produced documents. Kelly Dermody and I reviewed and revised many drafts of the motion and related materials. LCHB paralegals and other staff compiled, copied, and delivered the first of many vast evidentiary records to the Court.

20. LCHB maintains a centralized document management system that has version control (i.e., allows users to maintain prior versions of the document). It also maintains a record of who accessed and worked on a given document. From accessing these records I can see, for example, that LCHB generated 20 drafts of the class certification motion from August 20, 2012,

<sup>3</sup> In all, over the whole case Plaintiffs used at least 1,423 exhibits at depositions. Depositions were often double, triple, and (occasionally) quadruple-tracked for the same day. On March 29, 2013, Class Counsel took five depositions at once.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Ratner's primary responsibility during this time was reviewing and analyzing documents and communicating with LCHB's team about documentary evidence.

1 to September 29, 2012.

Name/Description	Doc. Num	Version	Edit Date
[W] Statement of Facts - Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	1	8/20/2012 10:54:19 AM
[W] V2 Statement of Facts - Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	2	8/20/2012 7:31:38 PM
[W] V3 Statement of Facts - Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	3	8/21/2012 5:25:36 PM
[W] v4: Statement of Facts - Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	4	9/3/2012 7:40:16 PM
[W] v5: Statement of Facts - Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	5	9/4/2012 10:39:03 AM
[W] v6: Statement of Facts - Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	6	9/5/2012 7:08:48 PM
[W] v7: Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	7	9/6/2012 1:00:14 PM
[W] v8: Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	8	9/7/2012 5:33:28 PM
[W] v9: Class Certification Brief	1,053,167	9	9/11/2012 5:26:50 PM
[W] v10: Class Certification Brief (9.11.2012 526pm)	1,053,167	10	9/11/2012 7:04:36 PM
[W] v11: Class Certification Brief (9.12.2012 930am)	1,053,167	11	9/12/2012 11:31:52 AM
[W] v12: Class Certification Brief (9.13.2012 pm)	1,053,167	12	9/19/2012 9:15:02 AM
[W] Class Certification Brief (JPF merge)	1,053,167	13	9/18/2012 5:20:07 PM
[W] Class Certification Brief (JPF merge)	1,053,167	14	9/20/2012 11:18:57 AM
[W] Class Certification Brief (JPF merge)	1,053,167	16	9/25/2012 9:49:53 AM
[W] Class Certification Brief 9.26.2012	1,053,167	17	9/26/2012 12:19:36 PM
[W] Class Certification Brief 9.26.2012 1219pm	1,053,167	18	9/27/2012 10:59:01 AM
[W] Class Certification Brief 9.27.2012 4:30pm	1,053,167	19	9/27/2012 7:27:04 PM
[W] Class Certification Brief 9.27.2012 7:30pm	1,053,167	20	9/29/2012 7:54:33 PM

13  
14 21. I can see that on the weekend before filing we created a new document and  
15 additional new versions.

Name/Description	Doc. Num	Version	Edit Date
[W] brief with kmd edits	1,059,552	1	9/30/2012 2:36:39 PM
[W] [V2] brief with kmd edits	1,059,552	2	9/30/2012 3:28:35 PM
[W] [V3] Class Certification Brief 9/30/12 4:30 pm	1,059,552	3	10/1/2012 1:57:04 PM
[W] [V4] Class Certification Brief 9/30/12 4:30 pm	1,059,552	4	10/1/2012 9:10:43 PM

20  
21 22. From looking at 1059552.1's history, I can see that Ms. Dermody created the  
22 document and had it checked out (*i.e.*, the document on LCHB's system was open on Ms.  
23 Dermody's computer terminal for review and editing online) for 3 hours, 9 minutes and 51  
24 seconds on Saturday, September 29, 2012:

Document Activity History: 10 Items						
User	Application	Activity	Date - Time	Duration	Page	
BOSCAR	WINWORD	View	5/3/2013 6:29:39 ...	0:0:0		
PDOUGHE...	OUTLOOK	Create ...	9/30/2012 3:23:15...	0:0:0		
PDOUGHE...	OUTLOOK	Checkout	9/30/2012 3:23:14...	0:0:0		
KDERMODY	OUTLOOK	Mail	9/30/2012 2:37:58...	0:0:0		
KDERMODY	WINWORD	Checkin	9/30/2012 2:36:39...	3:9:51		
KDERMODY	WINWORD	Modify	9/30/2012 2:36:39...	0:0:0		
KDERMODY	wwlib	Checkout	9/30/2012 11:26:4...	0:0:0		
KDERMODY	wwlib	Checkin	9/30/2012 11:26:4...	0:0:6		
KDERMODY	WINWORD	Checkout	9/30/2012 11:26:4...	0:0:0		
KDERMODY	WINWORD	Create	9/30/2012 11:26:4...	0:0:0		

23. Of course, the document management system records only part of the work that  
 11 goes into a brief. Lawyers sometimes work in documents on printed, paper copies for review  
 12 with handwritten edits, or in versions locally saved to their computers and not captured in the  
 13 firm-wide document tracking system (to avoid cluttering the system with multiple drafts). They  
 14 also often review drafts and provide comments and edits by email. They sometimes create  
 15 unique documents containing only sections of the brief which they edit as stand-alone documents  
 16 until the drafting is sufficiently final to be inserted into the comprehensive final document. And  
 17 the system does not reflect all the work that goes in to the draft, such as compiling evidence,  
 18 locating cites, legal research, and so forth.

19. Lisa Lebove of JSLF drafted a 10-page insert covering one argument in the  
 20 opening brief and made two rounds of edits. Mr. Saveri and Ms. Lebove offered comments on  
 21 the proposed order.

22. Plaintiffs also submitted and relied on the expert report of Professor Edward E.  
 23 Leamer. Among all the lawyers, I had principal responsibility for overseeing production of this  
 24 report. All comments and suggested changes to the report went through me (and most of them  
 25 were mine, although Mr. Cramer of B&M also offered substantial comments).

## 2. Document and Data Review

26. Through October 31, 2012, Defendants produced approximately 1,406,664 pages

1 of documents, which all Plaintiffs' counsel reviewed under Mr. Harvey's supervision. (Ms.  
 2 Shaver later shared in this supervising role.) In total over the course of the entire case, Defendants  
 3 produced 325,000 documents totaling over 3.2 million pages. Defendants also produced over 50  
 4 gigabytes of data consisting of 80,000 different files, which Plaintiffs' retained experts analyzed.  
 5 LCHB attorneys were the primary point of contact for all questions and issues regarding  
 6 Defendants' data, which required substantial and frequent follow-up with Defendants, including  
 7 30(b)(6) depositions regarding numerous data issues (such as definitions of data fields, integrity  
 8 and reliability, preservation, and whether additional data was withheld that should have been  
 9 produced).

10                   **3. Depositions**

11       27. Through October 31, 2012, Plaintiffs took 23 depositions. Of these, 17 were  
 12 30(b)(6) depositions concerning data issues and 6 were depositions of fact witnesses. LCHB took  
 13 12 of these depositions. G&E took five. B&M took three. JSLF also took three.

14       28. LCHB also defended the depositions of four of the five class representatives, all of  
 15 whom are clients of LCHB: Brandon Marshall, Mark Fichtner, Michael Devine and Siddarth  
 16 Hariharan. Ms. Leboe of JSLF defended the deposition of Daniel Stover, who is also an LCHB  
 17 client.

18                   **C. November 1, 2012, to February 28, 2013**

19       29. From November 1, 2012, to February 28, 2012, counsel performed the following  
 20 major tasks in the case:

21                   **Initial Class Certification**

- 22                  • Defending the deposition of Dr. Leamer;
- 23                  • Taking the deposition of Dr. Kevin Murphy;
- 24                  • Preparing a reply in support of the class certification motion, including a  
                             response to Defendants' *Daubert* papers;
- 25                  • Preparing the administrative motion to strike the *Daubert* motion; and
- 26                  • Preparing for and arguing the class certification motion.

27  
 28                   **Fact Discovery**

- 1           • Taking 21 fact depositions of Defendant witnesses; and  
 2           • Continuing to review Defendants' document productions

3       30. In addition, during this time, LCHB identified, retained, and worked with  
 4 Plaintiffs' consultant (later testifying expert) Kevin Hallock.

5       31. From November 1, 2012, to February 28, 2013, LCHB's principal timekeepers  
 6 recorded the following time:

Richard Heimann	143.9
Kelly Dermody	209.2
Brendan Glackin	357.9
Dean Harvey	746.3
	1,457.3

10      32. Other LCHB attorneys and staff invested substantial time in the matter for a total  
 11 of 3,912.5 hours recorded this period. A summary of all time recorded by LCHB timekeepers  
 12 during this period can be found at Exhibit C.

13           **1. Class Certification**

14      33. LCHB took the lead in all aspects of responding to the Defendants' *Daubert*  
 15 motion and opposition to the class certification motion.

16      34. I defended the deposition of Dr. Leamer.

17      35. Anne Shaver and I drafted and filed the motion to strike Defendants' *Daubert*  
 18 papers. Mr. Saveri and Ms. Leboove provided comments and suggested edits.

19      36. LCHB principally drafted the combined reply brief and opposition to the *Daubert*  
 20 motion.

21      37. For example, I can see that LCHB created 19 drafts (in two different documents)  
 22 of the consolidated response:

23

24

25

26

27

28

	Name/Description	Doc. Num	Version	Edit Date
1	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	1	11/28/2012 10:31:43 ...
2	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	2	11/28/2012 8:05:57 PM
3	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	3	12/3/2012 6:43:46 PM
4	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	4	12/4/2012 1:03:29 PM
5	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	5	12/4/2012 8:40:07 PM
6	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	6	12/4/2012 10:03:34 PM
7	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	7	12/5/2012 6:59:59 PM
8	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	8	12/6/2012 4:13:23 PM
9	[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED REPLY IN SUPPORT ...	1,068,566	9	12/6/2012 6:13:19 PM
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33				
34				
35				
36				
37				
38				
39				
40				
41				
42				
43				
44				
45				
46				
47				
48				
49				
50				
51				
52				
53				
54				
55				
56				
57				
58				
59				
60				
61				
62				
63				
64				
65				
66				
67				
68				
69				
70				
71				
72				
73				
74				
75				
76				
77				
78				
79				
80				
81				
82				
83				
84				
85				
86				
87				
88				
89				
90				
91				
92				
93				
94				
95				
96				
97				
98				
99				
100				
101				
102				
103				
104				
105				
106				
107				
108				
109				
110				
111				
112				
113				
114				
115				
116				
117				
118				
119				
120				
121				
122				
123				
124				
125				
126				
127				
128				
129				
130				
131				
132				
133				
134				
135				
136				
137				
138				
139				
140				
141				
142				
143				
144				
145				
146				
147				
148				
149				
150				
151				
152				
153				
154				
155				
156				
157				
158				
159				
160				
161				
162				
163				
164				
165				
166				
167				
168				
169				
170				
171				
172				
173				
174				
175				
176				
177				
178				
179				
180				
181				
182				
183				
184				
185				
186				
187				
188				
189				
190				
191				
192				
193				
194				
195				
196				
197				
198				
199				
200				
201				
202				
203				
204				
205				
206				
207				
208				
209				
210				
211				
212				
213				
214				
215				
216				
217				
218				
219				
220				
221				
222				
223				
224				
225				
226				
227				
228				
229				
230				
231				
232				
233				
234				
235				
236				
237				
238				
239				
240				
241				
242				
243				
244				
245				
246				
247				
248				
249				
250				
251				
252				
253				
254				
255				
256				
257				
258				
259				
260				
261				
262				
263				
264				
265				
266				
267				
268				
269				
270				
271				
272				
273				
274				
275				
276				
277				
278				
279				
280				
281				
282				
283				
284				
285				
286				
287				
288				
289				
290				
291				
292				
293				
294				
295				
296				
297				
298				
299				
300				
301				
302				
303				
304				
305				
306				
307				
308				
309				
310				
311				
312				
313				
314				
315				
316				
317				
318				
319				
320				
321				
322				
323				
324				
325				
326				
327				
328				
329				
330				
331				
332				
333				
334				
335				
336				
337				
338				
339				
340				
341				
342				
343				
344				
345				
346				
347				
348				
349				
350				
351				
352				
353				
354				
355				
356				
357				
358				
359				
360				
361				
362				
363				
364				
365				
366				
367				
368				
369				
370				
371				
372				
373				
374				
375				
376				
377				
378				
379				
380				
381				
382				
383				

1 Mr. Saveri sent two emails with comments and suggested edits. Eric Cramer of B&M also  
 2 provided suggested edits.

3 40. I deposed Dr. Kevin M. Murphy on Monday, December 3, 2012. From reviewing  
 4 my time records I can see I spent 16 hours over the weekend preparing to take that deposition, in  
 5 addition to further prep time during the prior week.

6 41. LCHB had sole responsibility for finalizing and filing the consolidated response,  
 7 and accompanying declarations and exhibits, on December 10, 2012.

8           **2. Fact Discovery**

9 42. During this period of time counsel for the plaintiffs reviewed thousands of  
 10 documents. The two co-lead firms split document review roughly evenly, assisted by B&M and  
 11 G&E.

12 43. LCHB took ten depositions during this period. Richard Heimann, Kelly Dermody,  
 13 and Dean Harvey were the primary fact deposition-takers for LCHB. JSLF took seven  
 14 depositions. G&E took six depositions; B&M took two.

15           **D. March 1, 2013, to September 30, 2013**

16 44. From March 1, 2013, to September 30, 2013, counsel performed the following  
 17 major tasks in the case:

- 18           • Completing fact deposition discovery, including depositions of 40 fact witnesses;
- 19           • Responding to Defendants' contention interrogatories;
- 20           • Drafting the supplemental class certification motion and overseeing the drafting of  
               two reports regarding the same by Dr. Leamer, and one report by Dr. Kevin  
               Hallock;
- 21           • Defending depositions of Dr. Leamer and Dr. Hallock;
- 22           • Taking depositions of Dr. Murphy and Dr. Elizabeth Shaw;
- 23           • Arguing class certification; and
- 24           • Negotiating and documenting the Pixar, Lucas, and Intuit settlements, and  
               preparing and filing the motion for preliminary approval.

25 45. During this period, as described below, LCHB continued to have principal or sole  
 26  
 27  
 28

1 responsibility for major case tasks, other than fact depositions assigned other firms. The three  
 2 principal attorneys working on the case for LCHB recorded the following hours:

Kelly M. Dermody	721.7
Brendan P. Glackin	376.8
Dean M. Harvey	1,050.5
	2,149

7 46. Other LCHB attorneys and staff recorded additional hours, for a total across all  
 8 timekeepers of 5,967.4 hours. A summary of LCHB time for this specific period can be found at  
 9 Exhibit D.

10           **1. Fact Discovery**

11 47. During this period of time LCHB lawyers deposed 17 of the 40 fact witnesses.  
 12 Co-counsel (JSLF, B&M and G&E) deposed the others.

13 48. Peter Barile of G&E analyzed Defendants' privilege logs for abuses.

14 49. Plaintiffs responded to Defendants' contention interrogatories on April 12, 2013  
 15 and May 24, 2013. These responses were prepared jointly by LCHB and JSLF. James Dallal of  
 16 JSLF and Anne Shaver of LCHB jointly compiled the documents and testimony cited.

17           **2. Supplemental Class Certification Work**

18 50. LCHB had principal responsibility for drafting the supplemental class certification  
 19 motion. Dean M. Harvey, Anne B. Shaver and I drafted initial sections of the brief. I made and  
 20 managed most of the final revisions, with substantial input from Kelly M. Dermody. LCHB  
 21 worked on five initial drafts of the document followed by 15 drafts in the last 5 days before filing  
 22 alone.

	Name/Description	Doc. Num	Version	Edit Date
1	[W] Plaintiffs' Supp Class Cert Motion	1,092,436	1	4/17/2013 12:56:15 PM
2	[W] v2: **Plaintiffs' Supp Class Cert Motion	1,092,436	2	4/17/2013 5:08:55 PM
3	[W] v3: **Plaintiffs' Supp Class Cert Motion	1,092,436	3	5/4/2013 7:55:08 PM
4	[W] v4: Plaintiffs' Supp Class Cert Motion	1,092,436	4	5/2/2013 7:24:47 PM
	[W] v5: Plaintiffs' Supp Class Cert Motion	1,092,436	5	5/4/2013 1:49:59 PM
5				
6				
7				
8	Name/Description	Doc. Num	Version	Edit Date
9	[W] PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CLASS...	1,095,373	1	5/6/2013 10:50:33 AM
10	[W] V2: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	2	5/6/2013 3:17:45 PM
11	[W] V3: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	3	5/6/2013 11:59:22 PM
12	[W] V4: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	4	5/7/2013 5:28:19 PM
13	[W] V5: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	5	5/7/2013 6:27:08 PM
14	[W] V6: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	6	5/8/2013 11:31:46 PM
15	[W] V7: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	7	5/9/2013 12:26:50 PM
16	[W] V8: PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CL...	1,095,373	8	5/9/2013 7:48:57 PM
	[W] V9: Supplemental Class Cert Brief (Clean) 5.9.2013 18...	1,095,373	9	5/9/2013 7:45:41 PM
	[W] V9: Supplemental Class Cert Brief (Clean) 5.9.2013 18...	1,095,373	10	5/10/2013 12:31:28 AM
	[W] V10: Supplemental Class Cert Brief (Clean) 5.9.2013 1...	1,095,373	11	5/10/2013 3:59:20 AM
	[W] V10: Supplemental Class Cert Brief (Clean) 5.10.2013 ...	1,095,373	12	5/10/2013 6:15:11 PM
	[W] Final Supplemental Class Cert Brief 5.10.2013 1930hrs	1,095,373	13	5/10/2013 8:36:56 PM
	[W] V13: Supplemental Class Cert Brief (Clean) 5.10.2013 ...	1,095,373	14	5/10/2013 8:46:01 PM
	✓ [W] V15: Supplemental Class Cert Brief (Clean) 5.10.2013 ...	1,095,373	15	5/10/2013 9:26:55 PM
17				
18				

51. LCHB's document management system can also be used to check the contributions of various timekeepers. For example, on Saturday May 4, 2013, Dean Harvey had the document open on his terminal for four hours and seven minutes.<sup>5</sup>

27       <sup>5</sup> Unfamiliar names appearing on the table are word processing operators who assist attorneys and  
28 staff with documents. Inputting hand edits and re-formatting documents are common tasks for  
these operators. LCHB does not bill the time of word processing operators, but treats it as  
overhead.

Document Activity History: 48 Items						
User	Application	Activity	Date - Time	Duration	F	▲
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	5/4/2013 8:06:28 ...	0:0:0		
JLESTER	WINWORD	Checkin	5/4/2013 8:03:08 ...	0:10:39		
JLESTER	WINWORD	Modify	5/4/2013 8:03:08 ...	0:0:0		
JLESTER	Microsoft ...	Print	5/4/2013 7:59:28 ...	0:0:0		
JLESTER	Microsoft ...	Print	5/4/2013 7:59:16 ...	0:0:0		
JLESTER	OUTLOOK	Checkout	5/4/2013 7:52:29 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Mail	5/4/2013 7:51:53 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Mail	5/4/2013 4:08:23 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	5/4/2013 4:06:32 ...	4:7:40		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	5/4/2013 4:06:31 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	5/4/2013 11:58:51...	0:0:0		
TGOTO	OUTLOOK	Mail	5/3/2013 5:53:30 ...	0:0:0		
TGOTO	WINWORD	Checkin	5/3/2013 5:53:17 ...	0:1:4		
TGOTO	WINWORD	Modify	5/3/2013 5:53:17 ...	0:0:0		
TGOTO	OUTLOOK	Checkout	5/3/2013 5:52:13 ...	0:0:0		
TGOTO	OUTLOOK	Mail	5/3/2013 5:49:00 ...	0:0:0		

52. LCHB compiled and prepared for filing the voluminous factual record. I, Mr. Harvey, and several other lawyers and staff were present into the wee hours of May 10, 2013, to accomplish this task. Ms. Lebove and Mr. Dallal of JSLF provided suggested edits and citations for the brief on May 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th.

53. During this time Mr. Barile of G&E and Ms. Schalman-Bergen of B&M supported the renewed class certification effort with fact and legal research.

54. LCHB had sole responsibility for overseeing the expert reports of Dr. Leamer and Dr. Hallock. I oversaw the work of Dr. Leamer and our statistical consultant. All comments and suggestions on this work went through me (and most of them were mine). Kelly Dermody researched, retained, and had primary responsibility for Dr. Hallock. Kelly Dermody oversaw the work of Dr. Hallock. Kelly Dermody and Dean Harvey spent many hours reviewing his drafts of the report and discussing it with him at length on the telephone.

55. LCHB had sole responsibility for taking and defending expert depositions in connection with the supplemental class certification motion. I defended Dr. Leamer's deposition (including preparing him for deposition) and took Dr. Murphy's deposition. Kelly M. Dermody prepared and defended Dr. Hallock's deposition and took the deposition of Dr. Shaw.

56. LCHB, principally me, had primary responsibility for overseeing the supplemental reply report of Dr. Leamer filed in connection with the reply brief.

1       57. The co-lead firms divided responsibility for different sections of the reply brief.  
 2 From reviewing the history of the earliest version, I can see that Dean Harvey had main  
 3 responsibility for creating the brief and drafting initial sections for LCHB. For example, on July  
 4 2nd, 5th, 6th and 7th he had the brief open at his terminal for long periods of time (from seven  
 5 hours to just under eleven hours):

Document Activity History: 69 Items					
User	Application	Activity	Date - Time	Duration	
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	7/8/2013 2:24:22 PM	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	7/7/2013 10:44:43 ...	5:55:50	
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	7/7/2013 4:48:53 PM	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	7/6/2013 8:03:31 PM	8:48:59	
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	7/6/2013 11:14:33 ...	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Mail	7/5/2013 4:19:20 PM	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Mail	7/5/2013 3:54:21 PM	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	7/5/2013 3:49:35 PM	7:0:39	
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	7/5/2013 3:49:35 PM	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	7/5/2013 8:48:56 AM	0:0:0	
ASHAVER	OUTLOOK	Mail	7/3/2013 2:14:36 PM	0:0:0	
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	7/2/2013 8:39:40 PM	10:58:28	
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	7/2/2013 8:39:40 PM	0:0:0	
LJUDGE	WINWORD	Close	7/2/2013 3:07:30 PM	0:0:0	
LJUDGE	OUTLOOK	View	7/2/2013 3:07:07 PM	0:0:0	
LJUDGE	WINWORD	Close	7/2/2013 3:06:59 PM	0:0:0	

16       58. LCHB created the first combined draft and had primary responsibility for  
 17 managing and revising the brief over the final week before filing. I spent many hours revising the  
 18 brief down to fit within page limits and re-writing large sections of it. From reviewing the  
 19 document history, I can see 15 versions were created over the final week.

20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

	Name/Description	Doc. Num	Version	Edit Date	
1	[W] PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEM...	1,120,075	1	7/11/2013 12:37:04 PM	
2	[W] PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLEM...	1,120,075	2	7/9/2013 11:50:34 AM	
3	[W] v3 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	3	7/9/2013 12:38:56 PM	
4	[W] v4 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	4	7/9/2013 1:54:45 PM	
5	[W] v5 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	5	7/10/2013 11:39:11 AM	
6	[W] v6 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	6	7/10/2013 11:41:48 AM	
7	[W] v7 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	7	7/10/2013 5:24:32 PM	
8	[W] v8 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	8	7/11/2013 10:47:36 AM	
9	[W] v9 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	9	7/11/2013 12:51:21 PM	
10	[W] v10 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	10	7/11/2013 1:31:24 PM	
11	[W] v11 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	11	7/11/2013 4:33:02 PM	
12	[W] v12 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	12	7/11/2013 7:18:14 PM	
13	[W] v13 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	13	7/12/2013 12:39:21 PM	
14	[W] v14 PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF SUPPLE...	1,120,075	14	7/12/2013 4:03:38 PM	
15	[W] v15 FINAL-PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF S...	1,120,075	15	7/12/2013 9:46:17 PM	

59. Once again, LCHB compiled, finalized and filed the voluminous evidentiary record.

60. JSLF drafted two sections of the reply brief and a proposed insert to the introduction. JSLF provided three rounds of edits to the brief and also proofread Dr. Leamer's report.

### 15           3. **Negotiation of Pixar, Lucasfilm and Intuit Settlements**

61. In the summer of 2013, Plaintiffs arrived at settlements in principle with Pixar, Lucasfilm and Intuit. Kelly Dermody and Joseph Saveri negotiated these settlements for Plaintiffs. The history of this process, to the extent it is not confidential, is spelled out in the papers submitted to the Court in connection with the settlements. For Plaintiffs, Kelly Dermody had principal responsibility for drafting and finalizing most of the settlement documents, with input and revisions from Joseph Saveri. (Of course, Defendants Lucasfilm, Pixar, and Intuit were also heavily involved.). Lisa Leibove of JSLF drafted the notice and proposed order.

### 23           E. **October 1, 2013 to October 30, 2013**

24. From October 1, 2013, to October 30, 2013, counsel performed the following major tasks:

- 26           • Overseeing the expert reports of Dr. Hallock, Dr. Leamer, Dr. Manning, and  
27           Dr. Marx, served October 28, 2013; and
- 28           • Attending the preliminary approval hearing and preparing further

1 documentation as required by the Court.

2 63. During this period of time, the principal LCHB lawyers working on the case  
 3 recorded the following hours:

Kelly M. Dermody	93.8
Brendan P. Glackin	63.5
Dean M. Harvey	117.9
Lisa J. Cisneros	45.3
	320.5

4  
 5 64. Other LCHB counsel and staff recorded an additional 118.1 hours, for a total of  
 6 432.6 hours across all timekeepers. A summary of LCHB time for this specific period can be  
 7 found at Exhibit E.

8  
 9 **1. Merits Expert Reports**

10 13 65. During this period of time, LCHB lawyers had primary responsibility for assisting  
 11 the experts in completing their reports. This included discussing with the experts the scope and  
 12 direction of the reports; reviewing drafts and providing comments and edits; assisting the experts  
 13 with tasks such as locating record citations; and then final formatting, proofreading, etc. LCHB  
 14 compiled all exhibits to the final reports and served them.

15 66. Kelly M. Dermody had main responsibility for overseeing the work of Dr.  
 16 Hallock.

17 67. I continued to have primary responsibility for overseeing the work of Dr. Leamer.

18 68. Dean M. Harvey and I had main responsibility for overseeing the work of Dr.  
 19 Manning.

20 69. Dean M. Harvey had main responsibility for overseeing the work of Dr. Marx.

21 70. Joseph Saveri reviewed and commented twice on the draft of Dr. Manning. Joseph  
 22 Saveri prepared a bullet point list of proposed topics to be addressed by Dr. Marx. Joseph Saveri  
 23 reviewed and commented once on the draft of Dr. Marx. Lisa Lebove reviewed and commented  
 24 twice on the draft of Dr. Manning. James Dallal reviewed the record and collected citations  
 25 relevant to the reports of Dr. Marx and Dr. Manning.

1                   **2. Settlement Approval**

2         71. JSLF drafted the motion for preliminary approval with Pixar/Lucas and Intuit,  
 3 which LCHB (through Kelly M. Dermody) edited and revised. LCHB also drafted the revised  
 4 Proposed Order, Notice of Settlement and Claim Form. Kelly M. Dermody prepared to argue and  
 5 argued for preliminary and final approval of the settlements.

6                   **F. October 31, 2013 to the Present**

7         72. From October 31, 2013, through signing of the settlement agreement with Adobe,  
 8 Apple, Google, and Intel in Spring, 2014, counsel performed the following major tasks:

- 9             • Respond to the Defendants' Rule 23(f) petition to the Ninth Circuit;
- 10            • Take and defend depositions of the parties' merits experts;
- 11            • Oppose Defendants' motion for summary judgment and motions to exclude  
                 expert testimony;
- 12            • Prepare for trial; and
- 13            • Negotiate and present to the Court settlements with the last four defendants  
                 (Adobe, Apple, Google, and Intel) and oppose Defendants' petition for a writ  
                 of mandamus against the order denying preliminary approval of the first  
                 settlement.

14         73. During this period of time, the three principal LCHB lawyers working on the case  
 15 recorded the following hours:

Kelly Dermody	857.4
Brendan Glackin	590.5
Dean Harvey	1465.7
	2913.6

16         74. Other LCHB counsel and staff invested substantial additional time, for a total of  
 17 5,540 hours across all timekeepers. A summary of LCHB time for this specific period can be  
 18 found at Exhibit F

19                   **1. The Rule 23(f) Petition**

20         75. On November 7, 2013, Defendants petitioned the Ninth Circuit for permission to  
 21 appeal from this Court's order certifying the litigation class. On November 18, 2013, Plaintiffs  
 22 filed a response. Joshua P. Davis of JSLF wrote the first draft of that response, which I

1 substantially revised prior to filing.

2           **2. Expert Discovery**

3       76. In November and December of 2013, the parties deposed each other's experts.  
 4 LCHB prepped and defended all of the experts designated by the Plaintiffs, and took three of the  
 5 six experts designated by the Defendants.

6       77. Specifically, the following Plaintiff counsel took responsibility for defending the  
 7 depositions of the Plaintiffs' experts:

9	Prof. Kevin Hallock	Kelly Dermody (LCHB)
10	Prof. Edward E. Leamer	Brendan Glackin (LCHB)
11	Prof. Alan Manning	Brendan Glackin (LCHB)
12	Prof. Matthew Marx	Dean M. Harvey (LCHB)

13

14       78. The following Plaintiff counsel took responsibility for deposing the experts  
 15 designated by the defense:

17	Prof. Elizabeth Becker	Kelly Dermody (LCHB)
18	Prof. David Lewin	Joseph Saveri (JSLF)
19	Prof. Kevin Murphy	Joseph Saveri (JSLF)
20	Prof. Edward Snyder	Eric Cramer (B&M)
21	Dr. Lauren Stiroh	Brendan Glackin (LCHB)
22	Prof. Eric Talley	Dean Harvey (LCHB)

23

24           **3. Opposition to Motion for Summary Judgment and Motions to Exclude**  
 25           **Expert Testimony**

26       79. On January 9, 2014, Adobe, Apple, Google and Intel each filed individual motions  
 27 for summary judgment, as well as a short joint brief.

28       80. Dean Harvey of LCHB drafted the consolidated opposition to the motions for

1 summary judgment almost in its entirety. This included making all arguments about the law and  
 2 compiling all the facts. I can verify this again by resort to LCHB's document management  
 3 system. For instance, I can see that LCHB created eight versions of the opposition from January  
 4 22, 2014, to February 5, 2014 (there were also prior and later versions created under different  
 5 document identification numbers).

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Name/Description	Do...	Version	Edit Date
✓ [W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' JOIN...	1,1...	1	1/22/2014 7:01:25 PM
✓ [W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' JOIN...	1,1...	2	1/26/2014 10:11:54 PM
[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' JOIN...	1,1...	3	2/2/2014 9:37:35 AM
[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' JOIN...	1,1...	4	2/2/2014 4:34:51 PM
[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' JOIN...	1,1...	5	2/3/2014 8:19:44 PM
[W] PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' JOIN...	1,1...	6	2/4/2014 11:25:37 AM
MSJ Opp (BPG eds)	1,1...	7	2/4/2014 8:16:54 PM
v9 MSJ Opp'n Brief	1,1...	8	2/5/2014 10:51:19 AM

14

15

81. Looking at the history of version 3, I can see that Mr. Harvey spent over 30 hours  
 in the document (not all of his activity in the version is visible in the image below).

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Document History						
Document						
Database:	LCHB_iManage					
Number:	1149956		Version:	3		
Description:	PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'					
Document Activity History: 28 Items						
User	Application	Activity	Date - Time	Duration		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	2/1/2014 1:44:03 PM	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	1/31/2014 8:01:05 ...	10:11:58		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	1/31/2014 8:01:05 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	Microsoft ...	Print	1/31/2014 8:00:27 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	1/31/2014 9:49:07 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	1/30/2014 8:24:08 ...	7:35:34		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	1/30/2014 8:24:07 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	Microsoft ...	Print	1/30/2014 8:22:56 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	1/30/2014 12:48:34...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	1/30/2014 12:48:27...	1:51:24		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	1/30/2014 12:48:27...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	1/30/2014 10:57:03...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	1/29/2014 9:27:42 ...	0:0:52		
DHARVEY	OUTLOOK	Checkout	1/29/2014 9:26:50 ...	0:0:0		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Checkin	1/29/2014 9:25:20 ...	10:43:22		
DHARVEY	WINWORD	Modify	1/29/2014 9:25:19 ...	0:0:0		

82. After Mr. Harvey circulated a complete first draft, JSLF provided draft inserts to

this brief on February 2, 2014.

83. On January 9, 2014, Defendants also filed motions to exclude the testimony of Dr. Leamer and Dr. Marx, and also a motion to strike Dr. Leamer's reply report.

84. I wrote the opposition to the *Daubert* motion against Dr. Leamer.

85. Eric Cramer of B&M wrote the first draft of the opposition to the *Daubert* motion against Dr. Marx. Mr. Cramer, Mr. Harvey, and I together revised the brief into its final form.

86. Darsana Srinivasan of LCHB created the initial draft of the opposition to the motion to strike Dr. Leamer's reply. I revised it into its final form.<sup>6</sup>

---

26      <sup>6</sup> Plaintiffs also filed on January 9, 2014, a limited motion to exclude certain proposed testimony  
 27      of Dr. Stiroh and Dr. Murphy. Lisa Cisneros of LCHB drafted this brief; Kelly Dermody, Dean  
 28      Harvey, and I supervised and revised it. JSLF provided comments and revisions and also drafted  
       a 1-paragraph section of the brief pertaining to Dr. Murphy. Plaintiffs filed a reply in support of  
       this motion on February 27, 2014. LCHB undertook principal drafting with comments and edits  
       from JSLF.

1       87. Kelly Dermody supervised and provided edits and comments throughout the  
 2 creation of all these documents, as she did with all other filings in the case.

3                  **4. Trial Preparation**

4       88. In the winter of 2014 counsel for Plaintiffs began various tasks related to finally  
 5 bringing the case to trial.<sup>7</sup>

6       89. Plaintiffs prepared and filed a motion on the applicability of the *per se* standard.  
 7 Eric Cramer of B&M wrote the first draft. I revised and finalized the document. Josh Davis of  
 8 JSLF, and Dean Harvey and Lisa Cisneros of LCHB, also provided suggested comments and  
 9 edits.

10      90. Plaintiffs prepared and filed *in limine* motions, and oppositions to  
 11 Defendants' motions. All four firms (LCHB, JSLF, G&E, and B&M) collaborated on drafting and  
 12 revising these briefs. LCHB finalized and filed the papers.

13      91. Plaintiffs created and met and conferred with Defendants about exhibit lists,  
 14 witness lists, and transcript designations. This included many lengthy meet-and-confers with the  
 15 Defendants to apply the parties' stipulation about authentication and admissibility of business  
 16 records. Dean Harvey and other LCHB lawyers took the lead on the meet-and-confers and created  
 17 all of the first drafts of various documents and pleadings.

18      92. Counsel retained an established, skilled jury consultant, and conducted various  
 19 kinds of testing with simulated potential jurors from the jury pool for this case. Because this  
 20 work is highly confidential and protected by the work-product doctrine it will not be discussed in  
 21 detail, save to say that it was thorough and consisted of multiple rounds. Plaintiffs' counsel also  
 22 had many trial-preparation tasks in progress at the time the initial settlement with Adobe, Apple,  
 23 Google and Intel was reached, which were discontinued when the Court vacated the trial date.  
 24 Again, this work never became public and is confidential and subject to the work product  
 25 doctrine.

26  
 27  
 28      

---

<sup>7</sup> Plaintiffs also filed a motion to compel, the subject matter of which has remained under seal and  
 which therefore will not be discussed herein.

1                   **5. Settlement of the Case**

2                 93. In the spring of 2014, Plaintiffs arrived at a settlement in principle with Adobe,  
 3 Apple, Google and Intel. Kelly Dermody and Joseph Saveri negotiated these settlements for  
 4 Plaintiffs. The history of this process, to the extent it is not confidential, is spelled out in the  
 5 papers submitted to the Court in connection with the settlement. Kelly Dermody had principal  
 6 responsibility for the drafting of settlement documents, with input from Joseph Saveri (and  
 7 Defendants).

8                 94. The Court denied preliminary approval of the Spring 2014 settlement.  
 9 Subsequently, Defendants challenged this decision by filing a petition for a writ of mandamus in  
 10 the Ninth Circuit. Plaintiffs opposed the writ. In the meantime, the Court set a new trial date and  
 11 also set pre-trial deadlines for things such as pre-trial disclosures. Plaintiffs began to prepare the  
 12 case for trial and would have been fully prepared and able to try the case. This included  
 13 additional conferences about pre-trial disclosures and admissibility of documents.

14                 95. In the fall of 2014, Plaintiffs and Defendants once again began discussing  
 15 settlement, under the supervision of mediator, Hon. Layn Phillips, a retired federal judge. During  
 16 this time, Kelly Dermody and Joseph Saveri invited the participation of counsel for Plaintiff  
 17 Michael Devine. Plaintiffs arrived at a new settlement in principle with Adobe, Apple, Google  
 18 and Intel at the beginning of 2015. Kelly Dermody and Joseph Saveri negotiated these  
 19 settlements for Plaintiffs. The history of this process, to the extent it is not confidential, is spelled  
 20 out in the papers submitted to the Court in connection with the settlement.

21                 96. Since then, the only work done in the case has been to submit preliminary approval  
 22 papers and the instant fee submission. LCHB led this process. LCHB has not included time in  
 23 connection with the fee submission in the accompanying detail and does not propose to use that  
 24 time for purposes of a lodestar cross-check.

25                 97. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the  
 26 foregoing is true and correct.

98. Executed this 7th day of May 2015, in San Francisco, California.

Brendan Slack

Brendan P. Glackin